

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Sammie Lee McCoy, #39452,
Sammie L McCoy,

Plaintiff,

vs.

State of South Carolina; County of York; Rock Hill
Police Department,

Defendants.

) C/A No. 8:08-1575-GRA-BHH

)

)

)

)

) Report and Recommendation

)

)

)

)

)

Plaintiff has filed this matter pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the State of South Carolina, the Rock Hill Police Department, and the County of York. Plaintiff alleges he was falsely arrested, and he maintains he should receive damages for his loss of employment, for mental strain, and for defamation. Additionally, plaintiff challenges the conditions of his current confinement, alleging he is exposed to unsanitary and inadequate living conditions where he is “locked down” for three quarters of each day.

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915, 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act. The review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of Correction*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995) (*en banc*); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); and *Boyce v. Alizaduh*, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979). *Pro se* complaints are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir.), and a federal district court is charged with liberally construing a complaint filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow the

development of a potentially meritorious case. See *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980); and *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. 319 (1972). When a federal court is evaluating a *pro se* complaint the plaintiff's allegations are assumed to be true. *Fine v. City of N. Y.*, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2nd Cir. 1975). However, even under this less stringent standard, the complaint submitted in the above-captioned case is subject to summary dismissal. The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Department of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990).

Counties, such as the County of York, may not be held liable solely because the County employs an alleged tortfeasor. See *Monell v. New York City Dept. of Social Servs.*, 436 U.S., at 689, 98 S.Ct., at 2035 (municipalities and other local government bodies are "persons" within the meaning of § 1983, but municipality may not be held liable solely because it employs a tortfeasor.). Plaintiff must identify a municipal 'policy or custom' that caused plaintiff's alleged injuries. If a custom that has not been formally approved by a municipality is widespread then a municipality may be subject to liability if the practice has the force of law. The plaintiff must also demonstrate that, through its deliberate conduct, the municipality was the 'moving force' behind the injury alleged. Plaintiff, however, has not made any showing to this effect. Consequently, the County of York is entitled to summary dismissal.

Additionally, the Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution divests this court of jurisdiction to entertain a suit brought against the State of South Carolina or its integral parts.¹ See *Alden v. Maine*, 527 U.S. 706, 713, 144 L. Ed. 2d 636, 119 S. Ct. 2240

1

The Eleventh Amendment provides: "The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against

(1999)(immunity “is a fundamental aspect of the sovereignty which the States enjoyed before the ratification of the Constitution, and which they retain today...except as altered by the plan of the Convention or certain constitutional Amendments.”); *Seminole Tribe of Fla. v. Florida*, 517 U.S. 44, 55-56, 116 S. Ct. 1114, 134 L.Ed.2d 252 (1996); *See also Federal Maritime Commission v. South Carolina State Ports Authority, et. al.*, 535 U.S. 743, 743, 122 S. Ct 1864, 152 L.Ed.2d 962 (2002)(state sovereign immunity precluded Federal Maritime Commission from adjudicating a private party’s complaint against a non-consenting State). Although the language of the Eleventh Amendment does not explicitly prohibit a citizen of a state from suing his own state in federal court, the Supreme Court in *Hans v. Louisiana*, 134 U.S. 1 (1889), held that the purposes of the Eleventh Amendment, *i.e.*, protection of a state treasury, would not be served if a state could be sued by its citizens in federal court. Thus, the Eleventh Amendment bars such suits unless the State has waived its immunity² or unless Congress has exercised its power under § 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to override that immunity. When §1983 was passed as part of the Civil Rights Act of 1871, Congress did not interject any language in the Act which would specifically override the immunity of the states provided by the Eleventh Amendment. Consequently, a claim brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983 does not override the Eleventh Amendment. *See Quern v. Jordan*, 440 U.S. 332, 343 (1979).

one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.”

2

The State of South Carolina has not consented to suit in a federal court. *See* S. C. Code Ann. § 15-78-20(e)(1976) which expressly provides that the State of South Carolina does not waive Eleventh Amendment immunity, consents to suit only in a court of the State of South Carolina, and does not consent to suit in a federal court or in a court of another State.

The defendant, Rock Hill Police Department, consists of buildings, facilities, and grounds. Inanimate objects – such as buildings, facilities, and grounds – do not act under color of state law. Hence, the defendant is not a "person[s]" subject to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. See *Allison v. California Adult Authority*, 419 F.2d 822, 823 (9th Cir. 1969)(California Adult Authority and San Quentin Prison not "person[s]" subject to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983). See also *Staley v. South Carolina Department of Corrections, et. al.*, 2003 WL 23541770 (D.S.C. Dec. 04, 2003)(Civil Action No. 9:03-3436-23BG), *affirmed Staley v. South Carolina Department of Corrections*, 96 Fed. Appx. 928 (4th Cir. (S.C.) May 21, 2004)(Not selected for publication in the Federal Reporter, No. 04-6022); As a result, the defendant Rock Hill Police Department is entitled to summary dismissal.

RECOMMENDATION

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the complaint in the above-captioned case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. See *Denton v. Hernandez, supra*; *Neitzke v. Williams, supra*; *Haines v. Kerner, supra*; *Brown v. Briscoe*, 998 F.2d 201, 202-204 & n.* (4th Cir. 1993), *replacing* unpublished opinion originally tabled at 993 F.2d 1535 (4th Cir. 1993); *Boyce v. Alizaduh, supra*; *Todd v. Baskerville, supra*, 712 F.2d at 74; 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A [the court shall review, as soon as practicable after docketing, prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to any grounds for dismissal].


 BRUCE H. HENDRICKS
 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

May 12, 2008
 Greenville, South Carolina

The plaintiff's attention is directed to the important NOTICE on the next page.

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court judge need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
P.O. Box 10768
Greenville, South Carolina 29603

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).